4.34 *The Plan recommends that a Waterfront Parking Implementation Plan be created in order to articulate those actions that must proceed in the future to support the Plan and the events that are deemed appropriate triggers for such actions. It should include at least four specific categories of implementation measures both to create additional parking opportunities and to protect existing residential areas:*

> *a. Public garage capacity. Monitoring utilization in existing public garages, setting triggers for the need for specific number of new parking spaces to be added to parking capacity at peak times. For example, assuming full utilization of on street parking, when the utilization of public garages in the waterfront core area reaches a level of 85% use, then additional parking spaces would be added to the parking capacity during peak times, through the use of garage attendants, valet parking programs, and the opening of now private garages (supported with appropriate wayfinding signage).*

> *b. Waterfront development. Requiring additional parking capacity at the point that new parking demand generators are constructed on the waterfront.*

> *c. Valet parking. Implementing a systematic valet parking program generally for Old Town and King Street, with specific emphasis on the waterfront core area.*

> *d. Protecting residential parking. Testing and monitoring the effect of waterfront development on residential parking areas, with the understanding that additional protective measures should be taken to protect those residential parking areas. The Parking Implementation Plan should be created immediately after the adoption of the Plan. It should be led by a multi-agency team and also be assisted by the advice of stakeholders affected by parking issues in the waterfront area.*

Discuss: Ballard, Ely, Lyle, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood

Comments

1. This needs to move forward immediately and should be a high priority. (Ballard)

2. Displaced parking, such as the parking lots across from Chadwick's, must be replaced 100%. What are the four specific categories? Parking issues must be addressed and fully resolved BEFORE adoption of the Waterfront Plan. The Waterfront Plan must be conditioned on NOT having increased restrictions on residential parking, such as having resident-only parking. (Ely)

   (Comment on 4.34a) Peak parking-space needs must be fully provided for in whatever waterfront plan is adopted by Council. It should not be assumed that parking issues can be satisfactorily addressed after a plan is adopted. (Ely)

(Comment on 4.34b) The question will be how much additional parking will be needed and where will it be located. (Ely)

(Comment on 4.34c) Reliance on valet parking to solve parking demand is a highly dubious proposition. (Ely)

(Comment on 4.34d) More restrictive parking rules for residential areas, such as resident only parking, could be very detrimental to Old Town's liveability by negatively impacting the sales volume of local shops. It would be far better to not overload Old Town with cars looking for a place to park. (Ely)

3. A parking plan should be implemented immediately. (Lyle)

   (Comment on 4.34b) Parking requirements should consider use of the building (Lyle)

   (Comment on 4.34c) Valet parking can be a contributor to congestion; limit to handicapped. (Lyle)

4. Parking is a big problem now and the Plan will have a major and negative impact on parking in the area. Plan proposals are weak at best. The "Waterfront Parking Implementation Plan" needs to be developed now and implementation has to begin in advance of other Plan activities. (Olinger)

5. (Comment on 4.34b) Limit new parking to off-street, enclosed, in garages. (Rhodeside)

6. Peak parking for the three hotels south of King St (2 on Cummings/Turner and 1 on RTS) along with the 3 restaurants, 3 meeting rooms, boat rental, civic building, marina, Beachcomber etc. must be better estimated; Parking south of King (Chadwicks, Art League, foot of Prince, West side of Waterfront park, south of RTS on Wolf) is eliminated. Add in valet traffic, cabs, congestion at foot of an elevated King St, Strand constriction at Boat Club, Fitzgerald Sq etc. and this plan does not work. Any or all of these measures could help, but parking measures in this area need to be reviewed against statements in Table 9 and Table 10 in the WFP. There is no Union street traffic and pedestrian study to support this parking and traffic analysis. This could lead to another recommendation to mitigate congestion in this area given road and traffic capacity. Both parking and traffic in this subsection of the Waterfront Core needs to be better evaluated to finalize a set of recommendations. (Wood)

   (Comment on 4.34a) Given 721 available spaces (excluding the untested valet approach and its suggested 1.5 factor in Old Town streets with single entrance garages and their cueing problems), and the Total Offsite Demand in Table 9 of 561, we are just 52 spaces short of the suggested 85% trigger (.85(721)=613). These 52 spaces could easily be consumed by hotel overflow. To the response that we can wait for the development, I'd suggest that parking elimination south

of King happens in phase one and construction on the Strand necessitates better alternatives ready now. It is not enough to "encourage" private garage owners, per the plan, to open spaces, if and when we exceed 85%. We are reasonably close to that now with the plan at hand. (Wood)

(Comment on 4.34b) See above. It is important to look at end state now since we can't change the capacity of our streets or add self-park public parking spaces later. When we run up against traffic created gridlock, there is no outlet to "alternate routes" or "traffic light metering." Traffic capacity (especially in the area south of King Street), parking place inventory, and pedestrian issues must be examined together now. (Wood)

(Comment on 4.34c) This plan lacks sufficient explanatory detail to evaluate. If this approach intends to push valet parking to surrounding garage space, it is untested on our traffic grid, within the design and proximity of our garages, and against the demand of our visitors. The Landini experience is not a sufficient test. California solutions are untried in Virginia. There is no example of what is proposed currently practiced anywhere in NoVa. Street parking is "effectively full" according to the plan. Valet parking must use our garages. All of our garages have one entrance. There are no "valet entrances." It's not the spaces that need to be maximized; it's the cueing problem at the entrances that need to be minimized. All cues will block traffic flow. Further, all garages north of the King and Union street intersection will be virtually unusable by the valet activities supporting the highest density south of King St who wish to move on Union. Better explanation of this proposed solution in the plan will help clarify how this approach will be implemented. (Wood)

4.35   ***Before new restaurant uses that place significant new demand for parking are allowed through the SUP process, parking solutions to meet that new demand will need to be calculated, identified and discussed in the SUP report recommendations in order to ensure that sufficient parking is in place contemporaneously with the opening of the restaurant.***
Discuss: Ballard, Ely, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood
Comments
1. We need to have a good definition of "parking solutions" so that this does not become a black hole for approvals. (Ballard)
2. The key question, though, is how much more restaurant space would be desirable east of Fairfax Street -- the less space the less need for additional parking. The City's waterfront plan anticipates far too much new restaurant space. (Ely)
3. Restaurants are a major traffic generator. The language should be strengthened to say that no new restaurant should be approved until its parking issues are satisfactorily resolved. (Olinger)
4. With the emphasis that new restaurant development should be encouraged. (Rhodeside)

5. Parking in this area cannot be approached in an additive and sequential way. This is a study in demand against capacity rather than just demand against the supply of parking places - capacity of the roads, capacity of available garages, capacity against safe pedestrian flow, capacity to live peacefully in a your private home, and traffic flow capacity. We need to know and discretely choose that capacity number as well as we presume to know density estimates. They are related, but our homes, our roads, our built-out parking capacity, and our estimated pedestrian growth (assuming our success on the Waterfront) are much less controllable than our control of density. Each new use in the waterfront core uses up this capacity - capacity to transit, capacity to park, capacity to live as a private citizen - in a way far beyond parking place utilization. Each additional use in the core area consumes some portion of this finite capacity. (Wood)

4.36 **Continue to implement the City's Wayfinding Program to facilitate access to public parking facilities throughout the waterfront planning area.**
Discuss: Wood
Comments
1. The current city's wayfinding program has yet to show success and shouldn't be emulated without empirical proof it works. (Wood)

4.37 **Continue to implement the recommendations of the February 2010 Old Town Alexandria Area Parking Study and the 2010 Old Town Alexandria Area Parking Work Group, including those strategies designed to encourage use of on-street spaces in shopping areas for short-term visits, to encourage the use of parking garages for longer-term parking, and to protect residential areas from excessive parking impacts.**
Discuss: Ely
Comments
1. More restrictive parking rules for residential areas, such as resident only parking, could be very detrimental to Old Town's liveability by negatively impacting the sales volume of local shops. It would be far better to not overload Old Town with cars looking for a place to park. (Ely)

4.38 **Consider implementing new parking technologies such as smart phone applications that show locations, rates, and spaces available in parking garages.**
Discuss: Wood
Comments
1. Yes, but….I'd suggest we discount parking for Alexandria citizens who park their appropriately "stickered" cars in our garages; further, I'd see if similar discounts could be offered for parking meters based on use of a credit/debit card bearing an Alexandria zip code. Many cities, particularly in tourist areas, offer such discounts to citizens of the local area who bear the added tax and traffic burdens of tourist traffic. Such an incentive could promote citizen use of underutilized spaces in traffic garages. Owners of these garages will welcome the revenue in place of losses from empty spaces. (Wood)

Development Guidelines (pages 92, 93, and 102): Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site and below grade. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio [for hotels] must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.

    Discuss: Ely, Rhodeside, Wood

    Comments

1. Below-grade parking east of Lee Street may not be economically feasible given that all of that land is fill land. Further, if any hotels are built in the waterfront area, a highly questionable idea, parking ratios should not be reduced given how far any such hotel would be from the Metro. The spaces per room ratio should be what makes sense for the waterfront area, not some industry standard. Low parking ratio will cause great community concern. (Ely)
2. New parking should be below grade and not visible from the public realm. It should not restrict development of ground floor retail or public uses. On page 93, add note: "…for similar hotels incomparable locations." (Rhodeside)
3. Not consistent with our language; should say on site below grade. The applied ratio should be consistent with city zoning requirements and industry norms for all uses. (Change to language)   (Wood)

Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses Policy (page 85): [Review] The availability of off-street parking for the restaurant's patrons and employees, including whether the restaurant has contracted with nearby garages for additional off-street parking for patrons and/or employees.

    Discuss: Lyle, Rhodeside

    Comments

1. Should encourage alternative parking for employees other than street spaces. (Lyle)
2. Note my edits. (Rhodeside)

Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses Policy (page 85): [Review] The extent to which garage spaces will be available to the public. Parking garages must be operated so that they are open to the public at least at peak times.

    Discuss: Ely, Rhodeside

    Comments

1. How can this be mandated for privately owned garages? (Ely)
2. Note my edits. (Rhodeside)

Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses Policy (page 85): [Review] Parking for visitors, customers and employees must be provided on site. Additional parking may be provided by contract with a nearby garage for patrons and/or employees. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.

    Discuss: Ely

    Comments

1. Below-grade parking east of Lee Street may not be economically feasible given that all of that land is fill land. Further, if any hotels are built in the waterfront area, a highly questionable idea, parking ratios should not be reduced given how far any

such hotel would be from the Metro. The spaces per room ratio should be what makes sense for the waterfront area, not some industry standard. Low parking ratio will cause great community concern. (Ely)

Additional WPWG comments on parking
1. Where will patrons find parking if the commercial boats (Dandy, etc.) are moved to the City Marina? (Olinger)